

Appl. No. 10/602269
Amdt. dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

REMARKS

In the aforementioned Office communication, the examiner rejected each of the claims in the application under Section 102 or 103 in light of the disclosures in the patents to Mead, Chung-Piao, or Gyori. Applicant has amended claim 1 upon which claims 2-7 and 12-15 are dependent, and canceled claims 8-11.

Before discussing the amendment to claim 1, which carries through to the remaining claims in the application as they are all dependent thereon, it is felt helpful to briefly summarize the prior art references.

Looking first at the patent to Mead, it can be seen to disclose a signaling glove wherein the glove has light-reflective surfaces and light-emitting units to illuminate the reflective surface. The patents to Wise, Guy and Gyori relate to fiberoptic apparel and it is a known characteristic of fiberoptics that light conducted thereby is transferred from one end to the other and not through its lateral or side surfaces so the cable is not illuminated along its entire length but only at its ends. The patents to Raz et al. and Chung-Piao are directed to gloves utilizing light sources but there do not appear to be any lenses or other light-transmitting materials used in the products. Finally, the patent to Orellana is directed to a glove that utilizes chemical materials for lighting rather than battery powered light sources.

In order to more clearly distinguish the claims in the present application from the prior art independent claim 1, upon which the remaining claims in the application are dependent has been amended to state that the illuminated glove defined therein includes a light source, a battery source, and a switch for selectively activating the light source and an enclosure having a lens in the form of a light-transmitting material

Appl. No. 10/602269
Amdt. dated April 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 13, 2005

wherein the lens is nonreflective and illuminated along its length. Not only has applicant been able to obtain an enhanced illumination of the glove product, but has done so in a manner that is not anticipated or suggested by the prior art. In other words, the glove as now defined in claim 1 does not use reflective material (as Mead) and is illuminated along its length (as opposed to Wise, Guy and Gyori) and further uses a battery source and switch (as opposed to Orellana) for activating a light that illuminates the lens along its length.

The claims remaining in the application having been amended to be patentably distinct from the prior art and there being no other objections or rejections of the application, it is felt that it is now in condition for allowance and such action is courteously requested.

Dated this 11th day of April 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary M. Polumbus, Reg. No. 25,364

USPTO Customer No. 20686

Tel: (303) 628-1500

Fax: (303) 629-3450

e-mail: polumbus.gary@dorsey.com

GMP/dtc